

III. REMARKS

Claims 1-20 are pending in this application. By this amendment, claims 1, 7, 8, 15, 16 and 19 have been amended herein. Applicants do not acquiesce in the correctness of the rejections and reserve the right to present specific arguments regarding any rejected claims not specifically addressed. Furthermore, Applicants reserve the right to pursue the full scope of the subject matter of the original claims in a subsequent patent application that claims priority to the instant application. Reconsideration in view of the following remarks is requested.

Entry of this Amendment is proper under 27 C.F.R §1.116(b) because the Amendment: (a) places the application in condition for allowance as discussed below; (b) does not raise any new issues requiring further search and/or consideration; and (c) places the application in better form for appeal. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request entry of this Amendment.

Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Gardner (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0177143A1), hereinafter “Gardner”.

With respect to the rejection of claim 1 under 35 USC 102(e), Applicants submit that the reference cited by the Office, Gardner, does not teach all of the features of the claimed invention, as is required under 102(e). For example, with respect to independent claim 1, Applicants respectfully submit that the cited reference fails to teach, *inter alia*, wherein the selecting system dynamically matches the input signature of a first Web service with the output signature of an adjacent Web service to ensure that each selected

Web service is compatible with the adjacent Web service in the chain of Web services.

See claim 1 and similar language in independent claims 8 and 16.

In rejecting claim 1, the Office alleges that Gardner teaches the dynamic matching capability of a selecting system *et al.* of the claimed invention by stating “[f]igure 12 and paragraphs 0049, 0064, 0065, 0078, 0081, 0098, 0105, 0106, wherein the bioinformatics systems matches the data types that can be entered into various modules and processes, and work cooperatively, in a chain, to come up with a result for a query.” Office Action, page 3, item 3. A careful reading of the cited sections (i.e., figure 12 and the plurality of paragraphs provided), and Gardner in its entirety, indicates that Gardner is completely devoid of any teaching or suggestion of any dynamic matching of input signatures and output signature of adjacent Web services in order to aid in forming a chain of Web services, as in the claimed invention.

Based on the citation, it is unclear to Applicants which elements in Gardner specifically teach the aforementioned limitation. For example, what element in Gardner teach “**adjacent** Web service”; “**dynamically** matching”; “**input signature**”; “**output signature**”; and, “chain of Web services”. (emphasis added). In the “Response to Arguments” portion of the Office Action, the Office appears to allege paragraphs 0098, 0105, and 0106 (and impliedly figure 12 which is described in paragraph 0098) are sufficient teaching in Gardner for the aforementioned feature. Applicants respectfully contend that figure 12, *et al.*

merely shows the various components of a drug discovery process that may be implemented by separate modules. See e.g., paragraph [0098]. Applicants contend that modules are not Web services.

There is no teaching of any type of, *inter alia*, input and output signature matching; adjacent Web services; forming a chain of Web services based on the dynamic matching, and the like. In sum, this cannot amount to a clear teaching and/or suggestion of the aforementioned limitation.

Further, with respect to independent claim 1, Applicants respectfully submit that the cited reference fails to teach, *inter alia*, database for storing a list of available Web services, further wherein the Web service comprises a computer program accessible over the World Wide Web. *See* claim 1 and similar language in independent claims 8 and 16.

The Office cites a data warehouse in Gardner as teaching the aforementioned limitation. Office Action, pages 2-3, item 3. Applicants respectfully contend that the data warehouse 210 is not the same as the database for **storing a list of available Web Services**. (emphasis added) Gardner states at paragraph [0049], for example, that “data warehouse 210 for storing various data including various bioinformatics data. Data warehouse 210 functions as a central repository for this **data** once it is gathered by bioinformatics system 100.” (emphasis added) This same paragraph continues to explain how said data warehouse 210 is coupled to “data parsers, data cleaners, and or data loaders (herinafter referred to collectively as data parsers 220).” Paragraph [0049] Applicants contend that this is a clear showing that the alleged database (i.e., data

warehouse) in Gardner would never have lists of available Web services because it is a data warehouse that is created to purge “pure” bioinformatics data and not a storage place for list(s) of computer program(s) accessible over the World Wide Web (e.g., Web service(s)). Accordingly, Applicants request withdrawal of the rejection.

Thus, Gardner does not teach all of the limitations found in claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection with respect to claim 1.

Independent claims 8 and 16 were rejected under the same rationale as claim 1. As a result, Applicants herein incorporate the arguments listed above with respect to claim 1.

With respect to dependent claims 2-7, 9-15 and 17-20 Applicants herein incorporate the arguments presented above with respect to the independent claims from which the claims depend. The dependent claims are believed to be allowable based on the above arguments, as well as for their own additional features.

IV. CONCLUSION

In light of the above remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that all claims are in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner require anything further to place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative at the number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: June 20, 2007

Joseph J. Christian

Joseph J. Christian
Reg. No.: 51,560

Hoffman, Warnick & D'Alessandro LLC
75 State Street, 14th Floor
Albany, New York 12207
(518) 449-0044